

REMARKS:

In the foregoing amendments, Applicants amend claims 7 and 16 by further defining that the aromatic amic acid oligomer [or oligomer solution] only has structural units of the at least two aromatic tetracarboxylic acid derivatives and the at least one aromatic diamine. This amendment finds support in the Examples and elsewhere in the Specification. Applicants respectfully request that the foregoing amendments to claim 7 and 16 be entered under the provisions of 37 C.F.R. §1.116(b), because these amendments place the application in condition for allowance.

In a previous Office Action, the Examiner withdrew claims 1-6 and 17-32 from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. Claims 9 and 11 were previously canceled. Claim 7, 8, 10, and 12-16 remain in the application for consideration by the Examiner. The Final Office Action included the following rejections of Applicants' claims:

1. Claims 7-8, 10, 12 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Paul (US 5,130,028) in view of Hawsegawa (*Structure and Properties of Novel Asymmetric Biphenyl Type Polyimides* in *Macromolecules*, Vol. 32, No. 2, pp. 387-396, 1999) as evidenced by Wilson (Polyimide, Blackie & Son Ltd., 1990, Pgs. 1-2, scheme 1.2). This rejection appears on pages 3 of the Office Action.
2. On pages 3-4, claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Paul in view of Hasegawa as evidence by Wilson and in further view of Kanetake (US 6,303,054).
3. Claims 7-8, 10, 12-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kanetake in view of Paul and in further view of Hasegawa and evidenced by Wilson. This rejection appears on pages 4-5 of the Final Office Action.

Applicants respectfully submit that the teachings of Paul, Hasegawa, Wilson, and/or Kanetake do not disclose or suggest the inventions defined in claims 7, 8, 10, and 12-16 within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §103 for at least the following reasons. The teachings of Paul were

used as a reference in all rejections of claims 7, 8, 10, and 12-16. However, the teachings of Paul require a terminally modified oligomer having DASA (diaryl substituted acetylene) at the end, which is excluded by Applicants' claims 7 and 16. For this reason alone, the presently claimed invention is patently distinguishable from the teachings of Paul either alone or combined with other references.

In more detail, the objective of Paul is to provide polyimides having high cured Tg, toughness, at maintaining their processibility. To achieve this objective, Paul developed a terminal-modified amic acid oligomer that is end-capped with DASA. The teachings of Paul cannot contemplate or should suggest the presently claimed aromatic amic acid oligomer [or oligomer solution] that *only has structural units* of the at least two aromatic tetracarboxylic acid derivatives and the at least one aromatic diamine of claim 7 [claim 16]. In other words, the presently claimed inventions exclude the end-capped structural units of DASA, which are required in Paul. To wit, since the teachings of Paul require end-capped structural units of DASA, one of ordinary skill in the art would have no reason to exclude the end-capped structural units of DASA, such as based on the teachings of Hasegawa, Wilson, and/or Kanetake, so as to arrive at the invention defined in Applicants' claims 7 and 16.

Viewed in another way, the solution proposed by Paul is a thermosetting (crosslinking) composition. In Paul, when producing the film, the DASA at the end is "trimerized" to form a benzene ring, thus providing a polyimide with a three dimensionally crosslinked structure. Such a terminally-modified thermosetting oligomer, as required by Paul, cannot contemplate or suggest an amic acid polyimide film having a normal structure as required by Applicants' claims 7 and 16.

As stated above, the terminal-modified amic acid oligomer proposed by Paul and the presently claimed polyamic acid are completely different compounds with different and mutually excluding structures. None of Hasegawa, Wilson, and Kanetake provides any reason to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Paul to eliminate the DASA end-capped structure required therein. Therefore, there can be no reason or motivation to combine Paul and Hasegawa, Wilson, and/or Kanetake to produce an amic acid polyimide film having a normal structure as required by Applicants' claims 7 and 16, and which excludes the end-capped structural units of DASA required by the teachings of Paul.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 7, 8, 10, and 12-16 are patently distinguishable from the teachings of Paul, Hasegawa, Wilson, and/or Kanetake. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the §103 rejections of claims 7, 8, 10, and 12-16 over these teachings. Since claims 7, 8, 10, and 12-16 are in condition for allowance, Applicants respectfully request the rejoinder of withdrawn claims 1-6 and 17-32 with claims 7, 8, 10, and 12-16 and an allowance of all pending claims in the application.

Applicants believe that the foregoing is a complete and proper response to the Office Action mailed January 5, 2010. While it is believed that all claims in this application are in condition for allowance, if the Examiner has any comments or questions, Applicants invite the Examiner to telephone the undersigned at the below listed number to resolve any outstanding issues.

In the event this paper is not timely filed, Applicants hereby petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fee therefore, as well as any other fees which become due, may be charged to our Deposit Account No. 50-1147.

Respectfully submitted,

/ R. Eugene Varndell, Jr./
R. Eugene Varndell, Jr.
Reg. No. 29,728

Posz Law Group, PLC
12040 South Lakes Drive
Suite 101
Reston, VA 20191
Phone 703-707-9110
Fax 703-707-9112
Customer No. 23400